Application No.: 10/594,916 Docket No.: 4633-0186PUS1
Amendment dated May 13, 2011 Page 10 of 14

Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2010

## AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please enter the attached New Sheet of drawings into the present application. The attached New Sheet includes Figure 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Figure 21 adds no new matter to the present application.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-13, and 16-24 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is

independent.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 11 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as

amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to show every feature of the

invention described in the claims.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the features pointed out by the Examiner

have been cancelled from claim I in the amendment set forth above. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

New Drawing

New Figure 21 has been added to the drawings. It is respectfully submitted that the

addition of this figure does not add new matter to the present application. The subject matter of

Figure 21 is supported in paragraph [0136] of the originally-filed application.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 4, 5, 11, and 13 because of several informalities. In

order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended claims 4, 5, and 11 in order to

correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this

objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Harushige (JP 2003-314856) in view of Jones (US 2,526,874). Further, claims 10-13 stand rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harushige in view of Jones, and further in

view of Hosoda et al. (US 3,805,542). Further, claims 16-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as

Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2010

being unpatentable over Harushige in view of Jones, and further in view of Maeda et al. (US 6,644,059). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 now recites a combination of elements in a humidity control system including:

- a casing which "has an internal space which is divided into a first space defined along a fan side lateral plate..., and a remaining second space," and in which "the air supplying fan and the air exhausting fan are disposed in the first space," and
- a compressor of the refrigerant circuit which "is disposed between the air supplying fan and the air exhausting fan in the first space of the casing" in such manner as to be included in an "air supplying side space" of the casing.

In the rejection, the Examiner admits that "Harushige fails to explicitly disclose that the compressor [...is] disposed in the first space of the casing, where the compressor is disposed in the air passageway of the casing..." (Office Action, paragraph bridging pages 4-5). Thus, the Examiner imports the teachings of Jones to cure this deficiency (id.). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Harushige and Jones fail to teach or suggest the above claim features, even when considered in obvious combination.

Jones teaches a refrigeration apparatus for heating or cooling the atmosphere within the interior of a vehicle which is used for transporting perishable materials (col. 1, lines 1-5). In Jones, the refrigeration apparatus is mounted so that a heat exchanging portion 12 extends into the vehicle's interior, while the other portion 14 is positioned on the forward surface of the vehicle (col. 7, lines 18-24). Jones teaches that the heat exchanging portion 12 contains an evaporator 50 which is in a heat exchange relationship with the interior of the vehicle (col. 4, lines 63-70). However, the compressor 26 of Jones is contained within the other portion 14, specifically, within an internal space 24 that also comprises the refrigerant condenser 25 and internal combustion engine (Fig. 5; col. 4, lines 36-43). Jones also provides a partition 16 filled with insulating material to insulate the heat exchange portion 12 from portion 14 (col. 4, lines 14-17).

Further, Jones teaches that the casing 18 surrounding portion 14 comprises air flow control means 20 and 22 (i.e., shutter assemblies). According to Jones, when the refrigeration apparatus is used to supply heat to the vehicle interior the air flow control means 20 and 22 are designed to

Docket No.: 4633-0186PUS1

Page 12 of 14

Application No.: 10/594,916
Amendment dated May 13, 2011

Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2010

Docket No.: 4633-0186PUS1 Page 13 of 14

regulate the passage of air over the condenser 25 and compressor 26 so that it does not dissipate the

heat carried by the fluid to the heat exchanging portion 12 (see col. 2, lines 12-48). Specifically, in

Jones, the air flow control means 20 and 22 can be selectively closed in order to allow air in the

interior space 24 to circulate from the compressor 26 to the condenser 25. This allows for the

condenser 25 in Jones to absorb additional heat by radiation from the compressor 26 (see col. 8.

lines 5-24).

Even though Jones teaches that a condenser can absorb heat from an air stream that has

passed over a compressor, such air stream is not supplied to an indoor space. Jones teaches that

there is an insulated partition between space 24 (containing the compressor 26) and the heat-

exchange portion 12 (which extends into the indoor space). In fact, Jones does not provide any route

whereby an air stream supplied from the outdoor space can be supplied into the indoor space. As

such, the compressor 26 in Jones cannot be interpreted as being disposed within an "air supplying

side space provided with the air supplying fan" as claimed. Therefore, Jones fails to remedy the

deficiencies of Harushige with regard to the aforementioned claim features.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hosoda nor Maeda is able to cure

the aforementioned deficiencies of Harushige with regard to the aforementioned features as recited

in claim 1.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the

combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by

the applied references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are

respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 4, 5, 8-13, and 16-24. Applicants submit that these

claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the

reasons set forth above. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 8-13, and 16-24 are allowable based on their

dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Request for Interview

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' representative. Jason

Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305), at telephone number (703) 208-4011 in order to schedule an

interview to be conducted before issuance of another Office Action.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

DRA/JWR/smj

Application No.: 10/594,916 Docket No.: 4633-0186PUS1 Page 14 of 14

Amendment dated May 13, 2011

Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2010

## Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes, Registration No. 47305 at the telephone number provided above to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 13, 2011

Respectfully submitted.

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000

Attachment